



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/281,969	03/31/1999	TAKESHI FUNAHASHI	Q53829	7976

23373 7590 05/17/2005

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

09/28/96

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20050512

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/281,969

**Applicant(s)**

FUNAHASHI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Stephen M. Brinich

**Art Unit**

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-21 and 23-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,7,9-16,18-21,23-26,28 and 30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,6,8,17,27 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/14/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see Response filed 1/26/05 (page 20, lines 10-15), with respect to the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, & 23 under 35 USC §102 and the rejection of claims 25-30 under 35 USC §103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made under 35 USC §112.

***Claim Objections***

2. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Claim 5 is not accounted for in the 1/26/05 Amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2624

4. Claims 3, 6, 8, 17, 27, & 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claims 3, 6, 8, & 17 (and dependent claims 27 & 29), the recitation "the normalization processing condition determined on the reading side is capable of being directly used for normalization processing" (claim 3, lines 14-15; claim 6, lines 15-16; claim 8, lines 16-17; claim 17, lines 16-17) appears to be inconsistent with the recitations in these claims indicating that the recited normalization processing means determines a normalization processing condition from a changed (i.e. not direct) form of this normalization processing condition (claim 3, lines 11-13; claim 6, lines 12-14; claim 8, lines 13-15; claim 17, lines 9-15).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9-16, 18-21, 23-26, 28, & 30 are allowed.

6. Claims 3, 6, 8, 17, 27, & 29, insofar as they are understood, would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Art Unit: 2624

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claims 9-16, 18, & 24 (and dependent claims 19-21), the art of record does not teach or suggest a determination of whether a normalization processing condition falls within a predetermined range in conjunction with the determination of a normalization processing condition for an image.

Re claims 1-4, 5-8, 17, & 23 (and dependent claims 25-30), insofar as claims 3, 6, 8, 17, 27, & 29 are understood, the iridial granule signal of Yamakita (read on the claimed "normalization processing condition") requires further processing prior to use for normalization processing, and thus is not "capable of being directly used". The signals that are "capable of being directly used" are derived on the receiving side, not the reading side, or the Yamakita device.

#### **Conclusion**


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2624

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 703-872-9306.

  
Stephen M Brinich  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2624

smb  
May 13, 2005